

conclusions, and recommendation to which specific objection is made. United States v. Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 673-75 (1980). The court need not address any nonspecific, frivolous, or conclusory objections. Battle v. United States Parole Comm'n, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987).

As chronicled in the FC&R, Harmon filed his application on June 26, 2009, some seven years after the date that his convictions became final. After finding that Harmon failed to assert any reasons justifying equitable tolling of the applicable one year limitations period, the Magistrate Judge recommended that Harmon's application be dismissed with prejudice as time-barred. Harmon's objections consist of nothing more than conclusory allegations that his state court proceedings were inadequate. These allegations do not demonstrate why he was entitled to equitable tolling of the limitations period.

Therefore,

The court accepts the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and ORDERS that Harmon's application for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 be, and is hereby, dismissed with prejudice.

SIGNED October 2, 2009.



JOHN MCBRYDE
United States District Judge